



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/475,962 | 12/30/1999 | FRANK JOSEPH PENNISI, JR | 9D-EC-19319 | 7121 |

7590 12/18/2002

John S. Beulick
Armstrong Teasdale LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, MO 63102

EXAMINER

VAN DOREN, BETH

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

3623

DATE MAILED: 12/18/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/475,962

Applicant(s)

PENNISI, JR, FRANK JOSEPH

Examiner

Beth Van Doren

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 December 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 8.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a non-final, first office action on the merits. Claims 1-48 are pending.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 2 is objected to because it contains a typographical error. Claim 2 contains the limitation "storing the result in a workload valve" on page 15, line 19. Based on the wording of the specification and claims 2 and 3, this limitation should more appropriately read --storing the result in a workload value-- and has been construed as such for examination purposes.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 3, 19, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Claim 3 recites the limitation "said respective workload value = (last workload value + number of filled slots) / (zip group maximum))." The mismatched parentheses included in the limitation makes it unclear as to what is occurring in the relationship. Based on the wording of the specification and claims 19 and 35, the limitation should more appropriately read --said respective workload value = (last workload value + (number of filled slots) / (zip group

Art Unit: 3623

maximum))-- and has been construed as such for examination purposes. Appropriate correction is required.

5. Claims 3, 19, and 35 contain the limitation “zip group maximum” on pages 15, line 24, page 18, lines 25, and page 21, line 23. Based on the wording of claims 1, 17, and 33, this limitation has been construed as --zone maximum-- for examination purposes. Appropriate correction is required.

6. Claim 3 recites the limitation “wherein the step of calculating the capacity utilization comprises the step of calculating said respective workload utilization” on page 15, lines 21-23. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claim 3 discloses that it is dependent on claim 1. Claim 1 contains no recitation directed towards “the step of calculating the capacity utilization” or “said respective workload utilization”. Clarification is required.

7. Claims 19 and 35 also contains the limitation “wherein the step of calculating the capacity utilization comprises the step of calculating said respective workload utilization” on page 18, lines 22-24, and page 21, lines 20-22, respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claims 19 and 35 disclose dependencies on claims 17 and 33, respectively. However, claims 17 and 33 contain no recitation directed towards “the step of calculating the capacity utilization” or “said respective workload utilization”. Clarification is required.

8. Claims 6, 22, and 38 contains the limitations “wherein said predetermined over capacity value is about 700 percent” and “ wherein said over capacity value is a workload greater than or equal to 100 percent” on pages 16, lines 9-11, page 19, lines 9-11, and page 22, lines 6-8. Based on the wording of these claims, it is unclear as to what is the predetermined over capacity value.

In page 11, lines 15-20, indicate that the first limitation should more appropriately read --wherein said predetermined over capacity value for the sum of selected days of the historical period is about 700 percent--, and has been construed as such for examination purposes. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-2, 9-11, 17-18, 25-27, 33-34, and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mowery et al. (U.S. 5,983,198).

10. As per claim 1, Mowery et al. teaches a method of tracking and predicting the capacity utilization of a goods delivery system, the system having at least one delivery zone, each delivery zone having capacity utilization matrix comprising a plurality of time slots, the goods delivery system providing a respective first potential delivery date, a respective order, and the

Art Unit: 3623

number of slots the respective order will fill, said method of tracking capacity utilization comprising the steps of:

getting the respective zone maximum and a respective number of used slots for a specified period of time within the respective delivery zone (See figures 4 and 5, column 2, lines 40-51, column 3, lines 51-54, column 4, lines 18-32, column 8, lines 24-29 and 61-67, and column 9, lines 1-14, which discuss defining a zone maximum for the deliveries at each location and the number of slots of the capacity used for a specified period of time, the slots defining levels within the delivery zone. Figure 4 specifically discloses the delivery zone and the slot levels);

determining whether the respective order can be shipped on the first potential ship date based on the number of available slots, wherein said respective number of available slots is equal to said respective zone maximum minus said respective number of used slots (See figures 4 and 5, column 2, lines 40-51, column 3, lines 51-54, column 8, lines 14-29 and 61-67, and column 9, lines 1-13 and 20-25, which discuss determining whether an order can be shipped on a potential ship date based on the available slots (levels) in the delivery zone. The availability of the capacity for the delivery is determined by the zone maximum (L_3) minus the number of used slots (L_2). See specifically figures 4 and 5);

returning a respective date that the respective order can be delivered (See column 9, lines 1-25, which discusses the processor determining the delivery schedule and returning schedule dates for a respective order (representing when to make the delivery) based on the delivery zone requirements); and

updating the respective capacity utilization matrix for the above specified period after the respective order has been included within said respective number of used slots (See figure 5, column 4, lines 12-45 and 56-61, column 5, lines 30-50, column 7, lines 15-33, and column 9, lines 1-13, wherein the central system is updated to reflect the scheduled delivery of the goods and the respective number of slots (levels) of capacity delivered and utilized in a period).

11. As per claim 2, Mowery et al. discloses the method wherein the step of updating the respective capacity utilization matrix further comprises the step of calculating the workload utilization and storing the result in a workload value for each of said respective slots with the delivery zone (See figure 5, column 3, lines 35-50, column 4, lines 12-45 and 56-61, column 5, lines 30-35, 47-50, and 60-65, column 6, lines 1-13 and 20-36, column 7, lines 15-33, and column 9, lines 1-13, wherein the central system runs analysis on the data to calculate the workload utilization of the plant and this determined value of workload and usage for a respective delivery zone is stored at the central system).

12. As per claim 9, Mowery et al. teaches the method further comprising the step of predicting the probability of a future respective used slot being full based on historical over capacity conditions (See figure 5, column 2, lines 40-51, column 3, lines 50-55, column 4, lines 1-3 and 33-45, column 5, lines 36-55 and 60-65, column 6, lines 1-13 and 18-37, column 8, lines 61-67, and column 9, lines 1-7, wherein the probability of future usage and slots (levels) being full is determined using historical data, such as over capacity condition. Capacity is outlined in figure 5).

13. As per claim 10, Mowery et al. teaches the method wherein the step of predicting the probability of a future respective used slot being full further comprises the steps of:

Art Unit: 3623

obtaining the workload values for a predetermined period of time (See figure 5, column 2, lines 40-51, column 3, lines 50-55, column 4, lines 1-3 and 33-45, column 5, lines 36-55 and 60-65, column 6, lines 1-13 and 18-37, column 8, lines 61-67, and column 9, lines 1-7, wherein workload data is stored and obtained for a predetermined period of time); and

determining the probability that the next used time slot will meet an over capacity condition using a distribution function (See figure 5, column 2, lines 53-67, column 5, lines 36-55 and 60-65, and column 6, lines 1-13 and 18-37, wherein forecasting is done to determine the probability that the next used slot will meet an over capacity condition. A distribution function is used to look at the data);

wherein said over capacity condition is defined as the state when the workload value is greater than or equal to 100 percent (See figure 5, wherein the over capacity condition is defined as a workload value over 100 percent).

14. As per claim 11, Mowery et al. teaches the method further comprising the step of predicting whether the trend line of the capacity utilization is changing (See at least figure 5 and column 5, lines 35-55 and 60-55, and column 6, lines 18-36, which discuss predicting whether the trend line of the capacity usage of a plant is changing looking at historical usage data).

Art Unit: 3623

15. As per claims 17-18 and 25-27, claims 17-18 and 25-27 are computer process implementations of the method of claims 1-2 and 9-11, respectively. Therefore, claims 17-18 and 25-27 are rejected using the same art relied upon in the rejection of claims 1-2 and 9-11, respectively.

16. As per claims 33-34, claims 33-34 are method claims directed towards the method recited in claims 1-2. Therefore, claims 33-34 are rejected using the same art relied upon in the rejection of claims 1-2, respectively.

17. As per claim 41, Mowery et al. teaches a method of predicting capacity utilization of a goods delivery system, the system having at least one delivery zone, each delivery zone having a capacity utilization matrix comprising a plurality of slots each slot having an associated workload value, said method of predicting the capacity utilization comprising the steps of:

predicting the probability of a future respective used slot being full based on historical over capacity conditions (See figure 5, column 2, lines 40-51, column 3, lines 50-55, column 4, lines 1-3 and 33-45, column 5, lines 36-55 and 60-65, column 6, lines 1-13 and 18-37, column 8, lines 61-67, and column 9, lines 1-7, wherein workload data is stored and obtained for a predetermined period of time, this historical data used to predict and forecast about a future slot's usage and over capacity conditions).

predicting whether the trend line if the capacity utilization is changing (See column 8, lines 30-40, which discusses looking at a trend line to predict and forecast if the capacity usage is changing. See also figure 5 and column 2, lines 53-67, column 5, lines 36-55 and 60-65, and column 6, lines 1-13 and 18-37, wherein forecasting is done to determine the trend and identify changes).

18. As per claims 42-43, claims 42-43 are method claims directed towards the method recited in claims 10-11. Therefore, claims 42-43 are rejected using the same art relied upon in the rejection of claims 10-11, respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

19. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-8, 12-16, 19-24, 28-32, 35-40, and 44-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mowery et al. (U.S. 5,983,198).

20. As per claim 3, Mowery et al. teaches the method wherein the step of calculating the capacity utilization comprises the step of calculating said respective workload value, wherein said respective workload value analyzes the last workload and the number of filled slots of the delivery versus the zip group maximum (See figure 5, column 3, lines 35-50, column 4, lines 12-45 and 56-61, column 5, lines 30-35, 47-50, and 60-65, column 6, lines 1-13 and 20-36, column 7, lines 15-33, and column 9, lines 1-13, wherein the central system runs analysis on the data to calculate the workload utilization of the plant. The capacity usage of a plant is analyzed to determine the workload of the plant. An analysis is run by the central system to determine the patterns in a plant's workload which looks at the last workloads of a previous period and the current amount put in the tank in the current period (the fraction of the tank filled on the current delivery)). However, Mowery et al. does not expressly disclose that the relationship of the

Art Unit: 3623

workload value is represented by the specific formula of workload value = (last workload + (number of filled slots) / (zip group maximum)).

Mowery et al. presents an algorithm that is used to determine the workload of a plant. Representing functional relationships in equation form is old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to represent this functional relationship in equation form in order to more accurately represent the functional relationship so that it is easier to comprehend and use by others.

21. As per claim 4, Mowery et al. discloses the method further comprising the step of setting a respective capacity signal when an over capacity condition and an under capacity condition has been detected (See figures 4 and 5, column 3, lines 50-54, column 4, lines 1-3 and 18-38, column 7, lines 34-43, column 8, lines 61-67, and column 9, lines 1-13, which discusses capacity signals when an over capacity or under capacity situation has been detected).

22. As per claim 5, Mowery et al. teaches the method comprising the step of setting a respective over capacity flag after determining that the sum of a set of said preselected workload values are greater than a predetermined over capacity value over a historical time period (See column 2, lines 40-51, column 3, lines 50-55, column 4, lines 1-3 and 33-45, column 5, lines 36-55 and 60-65, column 6, lines 1-13 and 18-37, column 8, lines 61-67, and column 9, lines 1-7, wherein workload data is stored and obtained for a predetermined period of time. See figures 4 and 5, column 3, lines 50-54, column 4, lines 1-3 and 18-38, column 7, lines 34-43, column 8, lines 61-67, and column 9, lines 1-13, which discusses capacity signals (flags) when an over capacity situation has been detected in the workload (usage) historical data. Deliveries cannot be made when the signal indicates the delivery zone as over capacity).

23. As per claim 6, Mowery et al. teaches the method wherein the preselected overcapacity values are set for the delivery zone/capacity matrix and wherein said historical period is the previous preset period and wherein the over capacity value is a workload greater than or equal to 100 percent (See column 2, lines 40-51, column 3, lines 50-55, column 4, lines 1-3 and 33-45, column 5, lines 36-55 and 60-65, column 6, lines 1-13 and 18-37, column 8, lines 61-67, and column 9, lines 1-7, wherein workload data is stored and obtained for a predetermined period of time. See column 8, lines 23-40, wherein the past trend information is used to show patterns. See figures 4 and 5, column 3, lines 50-54, column 4, lines 1-3 and 18-38, column 7, lines 34-43, column 8, lines 61-67, and column 9, lines 1-13, which discusses capacity signals (flags) when an over capacity situation has been detected in the workload (usage) historical data. Figure 5 indicates that the workload value of over 100 percent is considered over capacity).

However, Mowery et al. does not expressly disclose that the predetermined over capacity value is about 700 percent or that the historical period is the previous ten days.

Mowery discusses using historic workload data for a preset period to identify patterns that are employed when making decisions concerning scheduling goods deliveries, as stated in column 8, lines 24-40. Furthermore, Mowery discloses that over capacity is considered over 100 percent, as shown in figure 5, and identifying spikes in the workload usage during preset time periods, as stated in column 6, lines 20-30. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to choose 10 days as the preset period and to set an overcapacity sum for this time period in order to more accurately optimize the goods delivery by identifying overcapacity trends in data that are not economically beneficial to the supplier or customer. A capacity value sum of over 700 percent for 10 days would indicate that an

Art Unit: 3623

overcapacity value occurred multiple times during the period, thus showing a bad pattern for the historic period.

24. As per claim 7, Mowery et al. teaches the method comprising the step of setting a respective under capacity flag after determining that said set of preselected workload values are each less than a predetermined under capacity value over a historical period (See column 2, lines 40-51, column 3, lines 50-55, column 4, lines 1-3 and 33-45, column 5, lines 36-55 and 60-65, column 6, lines 1-13 and 18-37, column 8, lines 61-67, and column 9, lines 1-7, wherein workload data is stored and obtained for a predetermined period of time. See figures 4 and 5, column 3, lines 50-54, column 4, lines 1-3 and 18-38, column 7, lines 34-43, column 8, lines 61-67, and column 9, lines 1-13, which discusses capacity signals (flags) when an under capacity situation has been detected in the workload (usage) historical data. Deliveries should be made when the signal indicates the delivery zone as under capacity).

25. As per claim 8, Mowery et al. discloses the method wherein a preselected workload value is set for the delivery zone/capacity matrix and wherein said historical period is the previous preset period (See figures 4 and 5, column 3, lines 50-54, column 4, lines 1-3 and 18-38, column 7, lines 34-43, column 8, lines 61-67, and column 9, lines 1-13, which discusses setting workload values for the capacity matrix/delivery zone that identify the workload as at a minimum/under capacity. See figure 5, column 2, lines 53-57, column 5, lines 10-16, 30-55, and 60-67, column 6, lines 1-7 and 20-25, column 7, lines 34-44, which teaches looking at used slot (levels) information about a specified period of days. Figure 5 shows 3 months worth of data). However, Mowery et al does not expressly disclose that the preselected workload value is less than about 50 percent and wherein the historical period is ten days.

Mowery et al. teaches that the customer is allowed to specify the minimum levels and historical changes acceptable to them, as stated in column 8, lines 24-40. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow a customer to chose a workload value of less than 50 percent and a historic period of ten days in order to make the system more user friendly and adaptable to the specific needs of the user.

26. As per claim 12, Mowery et al. discloses the method wherein the step of predicting future capacity utilization further comprises the step of determining that the trend line of the capacity utilization for a first fixed period of workload values and that the trend line indicates the usage is changing (See column 8, lines 30-40, which discuss looking at trends in the data through analysis, this analysis indicating an increase in the pattern of the historical data. See column 5, lines 35-55 and 60-55, and column 6, lines 1-10 and 18-36, which discuss predicting whether the trend line of the capacity usage of a plant is changing looking at historical usage data during a fixed time period). However, Mowery et al. does not expressly disclose that the usage is increasing when the slope of the regression line for the period is greater than zero within a predetermined confidence interval.

Mowery et al. discusses using forecasting techniques to predict capacity utilization by looking at trends in past usage data to identify increases, as stated in column 8, lines 30-40. It is old and well known that a slope greater than zero indicates that a trend line is increasing in value. It is also old and well known in statistics to use confidence intervals when sampling populations of data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize these old and well-known techniques to analyze the utilization trends in order to more accurately predict usage needs, thereby optimizing delivery schedules, minimizing supplier

Art Unit: 3623

costs, and meeting customer needs, as stated in column 2, lines 20-25 and 30-33, column 5, lines 51-59, and column 8, lines 24-40.

27. As per claim 13, Mowery et al. discloses the method wherein the step of predicting future capacity utilization further comprises the step of determining that the trend line of the capacity utilization for a first fixed period of workload values and that the trend line indicates the usage is changing (See column 8, lines 30-40, which discuss looking at trends in the data through analysis, this analysis indicating an decrease in the pattern of the historical data. See column 5, lines 35-55 and 60-55, and column 6, lines 1-10 and 18-36, which discuss predicting whether the trend line of the capacity usage of a plant is changing looking at historical usage data during a fixed time period). However, Mowery et al. does not expressly disclose that the usage is decreasing when the slope of the regression line for the period is less than zero within a predetermined confidence interval.

Mowery et al. discusses using forecasting techniques to predict capacity utilization by looking at trends in past usage data to determine a decrease, as stated in column 8, lines 30-40. It is old and well known that a slope less than zero indicates that a trend line is decreasing in value. It is also old and well known in statistics to use confidence intervals when sampling populations of data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize these old and well-known techniques to analyze the utilization trends in order to more accurately predict usage needs, thereby optimizing delivery schedules, minimizing supplier costs, and meeting customer needs, as stated in column 2, lines 20-25 and 30-33, column 5, lines 51-59, and column 8, lines 24-40.

Art Unit: 3623

28. As per claim 14, Mowery et al. discloses the method wherein said first fixed period is seven days (See column 6, lines 1-10 and 19-25, wherein the first fixed period is seven days). However, Mowery et al. does not expressly disclose a confidence interval and that the confidence interval is about 95 percent.

Mowery et al. discusses using forecasting techniques to predict capacity utilization by looking at trends in past usage data. It is old and well known in statistics to use confidence intervals when sampling graphed populations of data. Furthermore, using a confidence interval of about 95 percent is a statistical standard. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize confidence intervals when analyzing the utilization trends in order to more accurately predict usage needs, thereby optimizing delivery schedules and minimizing supplier costs, as stated in column 2, lines 20-25 and 30-33, and column 5, lines 51-59.

29. As per claim 15, Mowery et al. discloses the method wherein said first fixed period is seven days (See column 6, lines 1-10 and 19-25, wherein the first fixed period is seven days). However, Mowery et al. does not expressly disclose a confidence interval and that the confidence interval is about 95 percent.

Mowery et al. discusses using forecasting techniques to predict capacity utilization by looking at trends in past usage data. It is old and well known in statistics to use confidence intervals when sampling graphed populations of data. Furthermore, using a confidence interval of about 95 percent is a statistical standard. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize confidence intervals when analyzing the utilization trends in order to more accurately predict usage needs, thereby optimizing delivery

Art Unit: 3623

schedules and minimizing supplier costs, as stated in column 2, lines 20-25 and 30-33, and column 5, lines 51-59.

30. As per claim 16, Mowery et al. teaches the method wherein said specified period of time is a preset number of days (See figure 5, column 2, lines 53-57, column 5, lines 10-16, 30-55, and 60-67, column 6, lines 1-7 and 20-25, column 7, lines 34-44, which teaches looking at used slot (levels) information about a specified period of days. Figure 5 shows 3 months worth of data). However, Mowery et al. does not expressly disclose that the preset number of days is thirty days.

Mowery et al. discusses using forecasting techniques to predict capacity utilization by looking at trends in preset time period's usage data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to specify a specific number of days, such as one month/thirty days, in order to in order to more accurately predict the plant's current usage needs, thereby optimizing delivery schedules and minimizing supplier costs, as stated in column 2, lines 20-25 and 30-33, and column 5, lines 51-59.

Art Unit: 3623

31. As per claims 19-24 and 28-32, claims 19-23 and 28-32 are computer process implementations of the method of claims 3-8 and 12-16, respectively. Therefore, claims 19-24 and 28-32 are rejected using the same art relied upon in the rejection of claims 3-8 and 12-16, respectively.

32. As per claims 35-40, claims 35-40 are method claims directed towards the method recited in claims 3-8. Therefore, claims 35-40 are rejected using the same art relied upon in the rejection of claims 3-8, respectively.

33. As per claims 44-48, claims 44-48 are method claims directed towards the method recited in claims 12-16, respectively. Therefore, claims 44-48 are rejected using the same art relied upon in the rejection of claims 12-16, respectively.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Hunt et al. (U.S. 5,835,716) discusses pairing requested deliveries with available capacities to ship.

Martin et al. (U.S. 5,960,408) discusses a delivery system that schedules delivery dates based on a requested date by the customer and the availability to ship on that date.

Asahara et al. (U.S. 5,528,489) discloses a scheduling system for scheduling the delivery of goods by assigning goods to deliverers.

Wojcik et al. (U.S. 5,758,329) teaches software and a system for managing customer orders and planning for the delivery of the requests.

Tsukuda et al. (EP 0 845 747 A2) discusses a distribution center for managing the delivery of goods and deciding a delivery schedule based on the availability of delivery agents and the needs of the customers.

Frank et al. (EP 0 425 405 A2) teaches an automated customer ordering system that assigns delivery dates based on the customer's requested date for the delivery of the supplies and the availability information. The system is a capacity planner.

Mendenhall et al. (*A Second Course in Statistics*) teaches basic statistic analysis using confidence intervals and trend line forecasts with confidence intervals.

"FERC decides on service and EBBs, passes on demand charge question" (Inside FERCs Gas Market Research) discusses the state of the art of capacity goods delivery into zones.

Armistead et al. ("The 'coping' capacity management strategy in services and the influence on quality performance") discloses a delivery system that uses forecasting models for capacity planning and goods delivery.

Chin et al. ("Decision Support Models for Natural Gas Dispatch") teaches predicting capacity needs of a good in a delivery system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Beth Van Doren whose telephone number is (703) 305-3882. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (703) 305-9643. The fax phone numbers for the

Art Unit: 3623

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7687 for regular communications and (703) 305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

end

bvd

December 13, 2002

TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600